



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,608	01/09/2002	Seiji Yamaguchi	15190	7027

7590 11/20/2006
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

GOTTSCALK, MARTIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3694

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/042,608

Applicant(s)

YAMAGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Martin A. Gottschalk

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/09/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. Claims 1-22 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-10, 12, 14-16, 18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosow et al (PG Pub# 2003/0074222, hereinafter Rosow).

A. As per claim 1, Rosow discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system (Rosow: [0009]) comprising:

a medical practice information storage unit for receiving medical practice information of a plurality of medical institutions from the plurality of medical institutions through a communication line (Rosow: Fig 1; [0067]);

a searching criteria receiving unit for receiving, through the communication line, searching criteria in accordance with which the medical practice information stored in the medical practice information storage unit is searched for (Rosow: [0087]);

and

an information delivery unit for searching for the medical practice information in the medical practice information storage unit in accordance with the searching criteria received by the searching criteria receiving unit, and for delivering the searched medical practice information through the communication line (Rosow: [0080]).

B. As per claim 2, Rosow discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 1, further comprising:

a medical institution information storage unit for receiving medical institution information, identifying a particular medical institution from among the plurality of medical institutions, from the plurality of medical institutions through the communication lines (Rosow: [0010]; [0091]; [0097]; [0101]);

a medical institution searching criteria receiving unit for receiving, through the communication line, searching criteria in accordance with which the medical institution information stored in the medical institution information storage unit is searched for (Rosow: [0087]);

and

a medical institution information delivery unit for searching for the medical institution information in the medical institution information storage unit in accordance with the searching criteria received by the medical institution searching criteria receiving unit, and for delivering the searched medical institution information through the communication line (Rosow: [0080]);

Note: Several of the following claims recite the same three general components of claims 1 and 2, namely

- i. an information storage unit
- ii. a searching criteria receiving unit, and
- iii. an information delivery unit

associated with a specific feature. In the following rejections of the claims, rather than repeating the entire language of the claim, the specific feature will be listed, and relevant passages will be provided. Note further that the reference discloses a computerized system, thus it should be presumed that the information

Art Unit: 3626

concerning the specific feature is stored, searchable, and deliverable by the features taught by the reference mentioned for claims 1 and 2 above.

C. As per claim 3 Rosow discloses the medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 2, further comprising:

geographic information (Rosow: [0014]).

D. As per claim 4, Rosow discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 1, further comprising:

request acceptance information (Rosow: [0103]; Fig 25)

E. As per claim 5, Rosow discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 1, further comprising:

personal information (Rosow: [0053]; Figs 2, 3, 4; [0101]; Fig 22)

F. As per claim 6, Rosow discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 1, further comprising:

transport information (Rosow: [0083])

G. As per claim 7, Rosow discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 1, further comprising:

food-service company information (Rosow: [0083]; Fig 1, item 44).

H. As per claim 9, it is rejected for the same reasons as provide above for claim 1.

I. As per claim 10, Rosow discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 9, wherein the medical service record information storage block stores

patient count information (Rosow: [0112]-[0113]; [0115]; [0128]; Figs 28 and 29).

J. As per claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons as provided above fro claim 10.

K. As per claim 14, Rosow discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 1, wherein the medical practice information storage unit comprises

study result information (Rosow: [0067], reads on "research").

L. As per claim 15, Rosow discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 1, wherein the medical practice information storage unit comprises

medical staff information (Rosow: [57]; [60]; [0108]; [0112]; [125]-[126]; Figs 37-38).

M. As per claim 16, it is rejected for the same reasons provided above for claim 15.

N. As per claim 18, it is rejected for the same reasons provided above for claim 1.

O. As per claim 20, it is rejected for substantially the same reasons as provided for claims 1 and 2.

P. As per claims 21 and 22, they recite a system and method substantially comprising the features of claims 1 and 2, but specifically reciting transactions occurring between a first and second medical institution. Because claims 1 and 2 cover these features for a plurality of medical institutions, claims 21 and 22 are rejected for the same reasons provided for claims 1 and 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosow as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Joao (US Pat# 6,283,761, hereinafter Joao).

A. As per claim 8, Rosow fails to explicitly disclose the features of this claim, however, these features are well known in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Joao who discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 1, further comprising:

life insurance information (Joao: col 16, lns 33-65).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Joao within the system of Rosow with the motivation of decreasing the cost of processing insurance claims (Joao: col 2, lns 1-12)

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosow as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Mohlenbrook et al (US Pat# 5,018,067, hereinafter Mohlenbrook).

A. As per claim 11, Rosow fails to explicitly disclose the features of this claim, however these features are well known in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Mohlenbrook who teaches a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 9, wherein the medical service record information storage block stores

operation count information (Mohlenbrook: col 9, lns 17-44; col 10, lns 65-67).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Mohlenbrook with the system of Rosow with the motivations of a) comparing actual costs to estimated costs for medical or surgical procedures performed in medical institutions and b)

estimating the cost of treating a patient at the time of admission to a medical institution so as to allow better cost management during the patient's stay.

8. Claim 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosow as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Comanor et al (US Pat# 5,860,917, hereinafter Comanor).

A. As per claims 13, Rosow fails to disclose the features of this claim, however these features are well known in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Comanor who discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 9, wherein the medical service record information storage block stores

complete cure rate information (Comanor: col 4, lns 50-65, reads on "odds of treatment success"; col 14, lns 7-19; Fig 6).

B. As per claim 19, Rosow fails to disclose the features of this claim, however these features are well known in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Comanor who discloses a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 1, wherein the medical practice information storage unit comprises

medicine information (Comanor: col 5, lns 38-67).

For claims 13 and 19, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Comanor within the system of Rosow with the motivation of allowing a clinician a more accurate assessment of a patient's treatment options (Comanor: col 7, lns 61-65).

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosow as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of DeBruin-Ashton (US Pat# 6,014,629, hereinafter DeBruin-Ashton).

A. As per claim 17, Rosow fails to disclose the features of this claim, however, these features are well known in the art as evidenced by the teachings of DeBruin-Ashton who teaches a medical practice information storage and searching system according to claim 15, wherein the medical staff information storage block stores

physicians' career information (DeBruin-Ashton: col 8, lns 15-22, reads on "specialties").

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of DeBruin-Ashton within the system of Rosow with the motivation of identifying the specialties of physicians who

Art Unit: 3626

previously treated a patient so as to identify physicians of the same specialty to treat the patient (DeBruin-Ashton: col 8, lns 19-22) where the patient has checked into a medical institution for treatment of a current episode.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied prior art discloses methods and systems for managing medical practices and institutions, and support systems for medical decision-making. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin A. Gottschalk whose telephone number is (571) 272-7030. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 8:30 - 6 and alternate Fri 8:30 - 5.

11. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



MG
06/23/2006



JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER